```
2
      APPEARANCES (Cont'd.):
 1
 2
      For Plaintiff
                              MR. THOMAS P. ROUTH
      Satijo in
                              Nolan Law Group
 3
      Case No. 18 C 8006:
                              20 N. Clark Street
                              30th Floor
 4
                              Chicago, IL 60602
 5
      Court Reporter:
                              LAURA R. RENKE, CSR, RDR, CRR
 6
                              Official Court Reporter
219 S. Dearborn Street, Room 1432
 7
                              Chicago, IL 60604
                              312.435.6053
 8
                              laura_renke@ilnd.uscourts.gov
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

(In open court.) 1 THE CLERK: Okay. 18 C 7686, Saputra v. Boeing. 2 3 THE COURT: Mr. Miller, if you've got a minute, can 4 you hang around after this? On -- completely unrelated to the 5 case we just talked about, of course. 6 Okay. Let's have everyone identify themselves for the record. 7 8 MS. LARSON: Good morning, your Honor. Bates Larson 9 on behalf of defendant, The Boeing Company. 10 MR. SHULTZ: Good morning, your Honor. Mack Shultz, 11 also on behalf of defendant, The Boeing Company. 12 MS. WISNER: Good morning, your Honor. Alexandra 13 Wisner on behalf of the -- Saputra. 14 MR. ROUTH: Good morning, your Honor. Tom Routh, 15 R-O-U-T-H, on behalf of a related matter, the Satijo matter, 16 that is -- has a motion pending before you. 17 THE COURT: All right. This is defendant Boeing's 18 motion for reassignment of related cases. I guess there's a 19 couple federal -- this all relates to the air crash off of 20 Malaysia --21 MS. LARSON: That's correct, your Honor. THE COURT: -- of the Lion aircraft -- the Lion Air 22 23 plane. And I have the lowest number, and there's two other federal -- two other cases in this court? 24 25 MS. LARSON: There's this case, and, your Honor, there

are two other cases that were recently removed --1 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 MS. LARSON: -- that are the subject of a separate motion. 4 5 THE COURT: And I understand that there's some 6 20 state court cases? MS. LARSON: Currently, yes. 7 8 THE COURT: And you're going to be removing all of 9 those? 10 MS. LARSON: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Is there going to be an opposition 12 to removal if -- or motions to remand? You can't really oppose 13 removal. But do you expect there's going to be any motions to 14 I know you can't speak for plaintiffs' counsel in remand? 15 those cases. 16 MS. LARSON: And these cases were filed originally in 17 federal court, your Honor, so I don't know that these 18 plaintiffs would be the ones with opposition. 19 The Multiforum, Multiparty Jurisdiction Act is pretty 20 clearly applicable in this case, so I don't think that there's 21 a good-faith --22 MR. ROUTH: Well --23 MS. LARSON: -- motion for remand in the anticipated removed -- cases that will be removed. 24 MR. ROUTH: I have spoken to counsel for some of the 25

state court cases, and they are going to be opposing it. Whether it's, as counsel said, not in good faith, I do anticipate they're going to try to remand those cases.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm certainly going to grant the motion to reassign. I've got the lowest number. The rules are I get it.

MR. ROUTH: I have no objection to that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. You're eventually, I assume -- I think you've indicated you're going to file a motion for *forum* non conveniens and try and get these cases kicked back to Malaysia.

MS. LARSON: Indonesia.

THE COURT: Or Indonesia, rather. It makes more sense, I think, for all of these cases to come from state court and get everything in one courtroom, whether it's mine or another courtroom -- presumably mine -- and then, if there are motions to remand, consider those.

And if -- those cases that remain here, either all of them or part of them, you can file your motion to have them go -- leave this Court on a *forum non conveniens* motion. I think that's the most orderly way to do it.

So the motion to reassign is granted. I don't know that we need -- well, I'll set it for a status in 60 days just as a precaution. I expect we'll be in here much sooner on various motions. If you can think of a way to expedite this

where we're not -- if 19 or 20 cases come from state court -- MS. LARSON: Yeah.

THE COURT: -- to at least half a dozen or more different federal judges and you're going to file motions to reassign them to me, I'll grant those without appearance because they all belong in one courtroom.

MS. LARSON: We have, your Honor, attempted to -we've marked the box on the cover sheet that the cases are
related, and we've also filed, to flag for the Clerk's Office,
a separate Notice of Related Case.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. LARSON: That has not so far resulted in them being assigned to you.

In others matters, we have had mixed success with that. We will continue to do that in an attempt to avoid as much motion practice on that as we can.

We do have another motion noticed for today, though, your Honor, a motion related to sequencing of discovery.

THE COURT: Yeah. And I'll get to that in a second.

MS. LARSON: Okay.

THE COURT: The other thing I'd like to raise is -- I don't think -- my brother, he works for the Clifford Law Offices. They do a lot of airplane crash cases. I don't know that they have any of these state court cases. I don't think they do.

1 MR. ROUTH: None of the currently pending state court cases are from the Clifford law firm. 2 3 THE COURT: 0kay. I --4 MR. SHULTZ: That's correct, your Honor. 5 MS. LARSON: That's correct. 6 THE COURT: All right. So I don't know if they get 7 involved whether that's going to affect my ability to stay on this or not. 8 9 And also, Ms. Wisner, I think I went to law school 10 with your father. 11 MS. WISNER: Yes. He mentioned that. 12 THE COURT: I assume it's your father. 13 MS. WISNER: Yes, it is my father. 14 So I put those things on THE COURT: Okay. Floyd. 15 the record. The matter relating to my brother's law firm is 16 not at issue at this point. And Mr. Wisner and I knew each 17 other in law school but haven't seen each other other than 18 another case he filed years ago here. So ... 19 MS. WISNER: He mentioned that as well, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: But that's on the record. 21 All right. Now the motion on sequencing of discovery. 22 Is there an objection to basically restricting discovery to 23 discovery that just deals with the forum -- the anticipated forum non conveniens motion? 24 25 MS. WISNER: Yes, your Honor. There is an objection.

And I'm happy to advise the Court as to the basis for my objection if the Court would like to hear it.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

MS. WISNER: Okay. Judge, as you had previously mentioned, this is just one case, and now two cases that are part of multiple cases that have been filed, some of which have not even been removed to this court yet, but Boeing anticipates removing them to this court.

By hearing this motion now, we believe that it's depriving the other plaintiffs in the other cases of having their opinions heard, their arguments heard as to whether or not they agree or they object to sequencing discovery. It's premature at this time considering all these outstanding cases and the early position of this case and the fact that this crash just occurred last October.

That being said, your Honor, what we request is to enter and continue this motion and defer until the other parties in the related cases may be heard.

If that's not the Court's inclination, our alternative argument, Judge, is to ask that we give -- have an opportunity to respond to this motion. This was a lengthy motion, and it included citations.

Also it included arguments relating to *forum non*conveniens improperly under the guise of a motion to sequence
discovery. And respectfully, your Honor, we'd like a chance to

be able to respond to that briefly, very briefly, but to highlight the fact that this is a products liability case, there's already evidence of a product liability issue, and Boeing is in Chicago.

So Boeing's had an opportunity to make some arguments in terms of FNC, but also in terms of how that impacts sequencing discovery. And we would like an opportunity to have a written opinion -- or excuse me -- a written brief on the same.

If that's not the Court's inclination as well, if the Court is inclined to just hear this motion today, then our position is, Judge, that *forum non conveniens* --

THE COURT: Well, I'll give you a chance to respond in writing.

MS. WISNER: Thank you.

THE COURT: They filed a 13-page brief. In fairness, you ought to have a chance to respond to it fully, although I noted it said that the plaintiffs' counsel in this case, the Saputra action, has indicated they won't object to limiting initial discovery to forum non conveniens issues.

MS. WISNER: Well -- excuse me, Judge. And I'll tell you why. We had gotten calls from counsel for Boeing. We work with them in a lot of different cases. We have a good relationship with them. And they reached out and asked us if we would agree to this motion.

The first thing we said was "This is too early."

There's all these other cases pending. This is premature."

And then we had said, "Well, look. If all the other cases are involved, if we have them, then we would agree to it."

But we don't want to step on anyone else's toes. I don't want to be put in a position where I have other plaintiffs saying, "Because you've now agreed to it, now Boeing's going to argue that, 'Well, you've already agreed to it for this one. Everyone else should fall in line.'"

I don't think that's fair to the other parties. And considering this isn't just a case involving just my case but presumably is going to involve over 20 -- or excuse me -- yes, over 20 other cases, I think they should have an opportunity to be heard.

And that's also before we saw Boeing's motion that argued FNC, which I wasn't told was going to be part of the basis for the motion to sequence discovery, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Well, any response from Boeing?

MR. SHULTZ: Your Honor, with respect to counsel's concern about the argument with respect to FNC, it's not our intent to have the Court decide that issue right now, obviously. It was just an attempt to put forth enough information that the Court would understand there is a

good-faith motion for *forum non conveniens* that will be put before the Court.

THE COURT: Well, here's how -- and I don't mean to interrupt, but I think I've made up on my mind on this. I'm going to enter and continue your motion. It doesn't make a lot of sense if I'm going to have 20 other sets of plaintiffs' lawyers here, some trying to get the case remanded back to state court, some agreeing to stay here, but one way or the other me ruling, for me to rule on what the discovery in this case will be until everyone has a seat at the table and can raise their objections. I think your point is well taken there.

And rather than have you brief it, why don't -- and me getting potentially 19 different briefs, why don't we wait and see how this case lands and ends up in final form in front of me so that I can rule on this motion. No discovery is going to take place before that, so it's -- no need to decide this.

I assume there's non-destruct orders in place. Or are there?

MR. SHULTZ: Your Honor, we've taken steps to preserve relevant documents and information relating to the case.

And just to elaborate, the reason we brought the motion at the outset. We understand it's more efficient to have it heard when everyone is here. But with the mandatory initial disclosures pilot program, we were concerned about the

potential obligation to begin producing large volumes of documents.

THE COURT: There's an exception to the mandatory disclosures that deal with jurisdictional issues. I think a forum non conveniens motion is close enough to a jurisdictional question on a case of this magnitude to not require the mandatory disclosures at this time. There's plenty of issues here that I think involve more complexity than keeping the mandatory disclosure obligations in place. I'd much rather we have everyone here, decide this motion at that time. And that's how we'll do it.

So did we give a date on the 60 days out, Sandy?

THE CLERK: No, we did not. 60 days out from today takes us to March -- maybe March 5th.

THE COURT: Okay. Does that date work?

MS. WISNER: That's fine for me, your Honor.

MR. SHULTZ: That's fine, your Honor.

I believe there's currently a status hearing set for January 28th in this matter. I assume that will be struck.

THE COURT: That's going to be stricken.

And the motions to reassign are -- if you notice them up, keep watching the docket. I'll likely just grant those without appearance.

MS. LARSON: There is one noticed for this Wednesday, your Honor, for the first two cases that have been removed.

```
THE COURT: Okay. Then those -- those motions are
 1
 2
      going to be granted.
 3
               MS. LARSON: Okay. We'll monitor the docket.
 4
               THE COURT: We'll make sure an order is entered to
 5
      grant those. No need to appear. And I'll do that on all the
 6
      other ones that come in. And then I'm sure I'll get some
 7
      motions to remand, or it sounds like I will, and those we'll
 8
      have to set a briefing schedule on.
 9
               But we'll keep the 60-day date just in case nothing
10
      happens between now and then. Unlikely.
11
               MS. LARSON:
                            Thank you.
12
               MR. ROUTH:
                           Thank you, your Honor.
13
               MR. SHULTZ: Thank you.
14
                           All right. Anything else we need to
               THE COURT:
15
      discuss today?
16
               MR. SHULTZ: No, your Honor.
17
               MS. WISNER:
                            Not from our position.
18
               THE COURT:
                           All right. Thank you all.
19
               MR. SHULTZ: Thank you, your Honor.
20
               MR. ROUTH:
                           Thank you.
21
               MS. WISNER:
                            Thank you.
22
               MS. LARSON:
                            Thank you, Judge.
23
          (Concluded at 9:36 a.m.)
24
```

CERTIFICATE I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. January 11, 2019 /s/ LAURA R. RENKE LAURA R. RENKE, CSR, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter